



Brand Performance Check
Teamdress Holding GmbH

This report covers the evaluation period 01-01-2020 to 31-12-2020

About the Brand Performance Check

Fair Wear Foundation (Fair Wear) believes that improving conditions for apparel product location workers requires change at many levels. Traditional efforts to improve conditions focus primarily on the product location. Fair Wear, however, believes that the management decisions of clothing brands have an enormous influence for good or ill on product location conditions.

Fair Wear's Brand Performance Check is a tool to evaluate and report on the activities of Fair Wear's member companies. The Checks examine how member company management systems support Fair Wear's Code of Labour Practices. They evaluate the parts of member company supply chains where clothing is assembled. This is the most labour intensive part of garment supply chains, and where brands can have the most influence over working conditions.

In most apparel supply chains, clothing brands do not own product locations, and most product locations work for many different brands. This means that in most cases Fair Wear member companies have influence, but not direct control, over working conditions. As a result, the Brand Performance Checks focus primarily on verifying the efforts of member companies. Outcomes at the product location level are assessed via audits and complaint reports, however the complexity of the supply chains means that even the best efforts of Fair Wear member companies cannot guarantee results.

Even if outcomes at the product location level cannot be guaranteed, the importance of good management practices by member companies cannot be understated. Even one concerned customer at a product location can have significant positive impacts on a range of issues like health and safety conditions or freedom of association. And if one customer at a product location can demonstrate that improvements are possible, other customers no longer have an excuse not to act. The development and sharing of these types of best practices has long been a core part of Fair Wear's work.

The Brand Performance Check system is designed to accommodate the range of structures and strengths that different companies have, and reflects the different ways that brands can support better working conditions.

This report is based on interviews with member company employees who play important roles in the management of supply chains, and a variety of documentation sources, financial records, supplier data. The findings from the Brand Performance Check are summarized and published at www.fairwear.org. The online [Brand Performance Check Guide](#) provides more information about the indicators.

This years' report covers the response of our members and the impact on their supply chain due to the Covid-19 pandemic which started in 2020. The outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic limited the brands' ability to visit and audit factories. To ensure the monitoring of working conditions throughout the pandemic, Fair Wear and its member brands made use of additional monitoring tools, such as complaints reports, surveys, and the consultation of local stakeholders. These sources may not provide as detailed insights as audit reports. To assess outcomes at production location level, we have included all available types of evidence to provide an accurate overview of the brands' management systems and their efforts to improve working conditions. Nevertheless, brands should resume verifying working conditions through audits when the situation allows for.

Brand Performance Check Overview

Teamdress Holding GmbH

Evaluation Period: 01-01-2020 to 31-12-2020

Member company information	
Headquarters:	Hamburg , Germany
Member since:	2019-04-09
Product types:	Workwear
Production in countries where Fair Wear is active:	
Production in other countries:	Albania, Lithuania, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, Uzbekistan
Basic requirements	
Workplan and projected production location data for upcoming year have been submitted?	Yes
Actual production location data for evaluation period was submitted?	Yes
Membership fee has been paid?	Yes
Scoring overview	
% of own production under monitoring	65%
Benchmarking score	57
Category	Good

Summary:

Teamdress has met most of Fair Wear's performance requirements. The member brand's total benchmarking score of 57 places it in the 'Good' category. Teamdress surpasses Fair Wear's monitoring threshold for members after two years of membership by monitoring 65% of production.

Corona Addendum:

As a workwear company, Teamdress was less affected by COVID-19 than many fashion brands. However, Teamdress saw a decrease in its workwear turnover, whereas the PPE and health care workwear turnover increased. Overall, Teamdress' total turnover was less in 2020 than in the previous financial years. Despite this, Teamdress did not cancel or postpone any orders to its suppliers.

When Teamdress did not have customers' orders to fill, it used the available production capacity at its suppliers to produce items to add to its own stock. As Teamdress mainly works from customer orders and tenures, it did not have issues with shops closing or having to move to a predominantly web shop-based sales model.

In the first few months of the pandemic, Teamdress did not experience many problems as its production is predominantly located in Eastern Europe. In fact, Teamdress' headquarters in Germany experienced a lockdown before the production countries did. Teamdress works with its suppliers on a contract basis in which they agree upon what production capacity in weekly minutes is available for Teamdress' orders. This contract-based buying ensured stability and security for Teamdress' suppliers. However, Teamdress remained flexible regarding the available production capacity at suppliers and adjusted its orders according to suppliers' needs. This was either to decrease its orders to fit the available production capacity and not put undue production pressure on the suppliers, for example, when they had a slightly reduced workforce due to school closures. Or it was to increase orders if other customers at the suppliers decreased or cancelled their orders. Indeed, one of the biggest risks identified by Teamdress in its production countries was the cancellation of orders and, through that, loss of jobs and wages for workers, which they mitigated in this way.

The other main risk identified by Teamdress was the health and safety of the workers in its suppliers. Here, Teamdress differentiated between its own and its CMT factories in its approach. In its own factories, Teamdress took a hands-on approach in implemented health and safety measures: It installed plexiglass sheets between the workstations, ensured workers had facemasks, organised safe travel to and from the factories, organised for all workers from one factory in Moldova to be tested for COVID-19 after an outbreak in the factory, and organised worker awareness training. These measures were paid for by Teamdress and verified through photographs, video calls, etc. In its CMT factories, Teamdress discussed health and safety measures with management and verified that measures were taken but did not support their implementation, financially or otherwise.

Teamdress maintained close contact with its suppliers throughout the pandemic. Usually, Teamdress has a weekly call with all suppliers to discuss the available production capacity and to determine next week's orders. This continued during the pandemic and was supplemented with calls and emails whenever required by either the suppliers or Teamdress. This regular contact allowed Teamdress to respond quickly to issues and find solutions together with the suppliers. Teamdress, furthermore, organised a self-assessment questionnaire for all its suppliers, to gain insights into the situation at the factories while audits were not possible, but the value of these were limited as the results were too positive. The company carried out an online internal audit at one of its own suppliers and an external audit in December 2020 – as soon as this was possible.

Teamdress paused several projects in 2020 as it prioritised following up on COVID-19-related issues. These included project related to training suppliers about Fair Wear's CoLP and grievance mechanism, living wages and discussing country specific risks such as homophobia. As these topics are complex and sometimes sensitive, Teamdress preferred to discuss these in person with its suppliers, which was not possible due to travel restrictions. When Teamdress is able to travel to its suppliers again, it aims to pick these projects up again.

Overall, Teamdress's strong systems meant that it was resilient through the pandemic and able to respond to issues in a quick and flexible manner.

Performance Category Overview

Leader: This category is for member companies who are doing exceptionally well, and are operating at an advanced level. Leaders show best practices in complex areas such as living wages and freedom of association.

Good: It is Fair Wear's belief that member companies who are making a serious effort to implement the Code of Labour Practices—the vast majority of Fair Wear member companies—are 'doing good' and deserve to be recognized as such. They are also doing more than the average clothing company, and have allowed their internal processes to be examined and publicly reported on by an independent NGO. The majority of member companies will receive a 'Good' rating.

Needs Improvement: Member companies are most likely to find themselves in this category when major unexpected problems have arisen, or if they are unable or unwilling to seriously work towards CoLP implementation. Member companies may be in this category for one year only after which they should either move up to Good, or will be moved to suspended.

Suspended: Member companies who either fail to meet one of the Basic Requirements, have had major internal changes which means membership must be put on hold for a maximum of one year, or have been in Needs Improvement for more than one year. Member companies may remain in this category for one year maximum, after which termination proceedings will come into force.

Categories are calculated based on a combination of benchmarking score and the percentage of own production under monitoring. The specific requirements for each category are outlined in the Brand Performance Check Guide.

1. Purchasing Practices

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.1a Percentage of production volume from production locations where member company buys at least 10% of production capacity.	96%	Member companies with less than 10% of a production location's production capacity generally have limited influence on production location managers to make changes.	Supplier information provided by member company.	4	4	0

Comment: The total production volume where Teamdress buys at least 10% of the production capacity is 96%.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.1b Percentage of production volume from production locations where member company buys less than 2% of its total FOB.	2%	Fair Wear provides incentives to clothing brands to consolidate their supplier base, especially at the tail end, as much as possible, and rewards those members who have a small tail end. Shortening the tail end reduces social compliance risks and enhances the impact of efficient use of capital and remediation efforts.	Production location information as provided to Fair Wear.	3	4	0

Comment: Total production volume where Teamdress buys less than 2% of its total FOB is 2%.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.2 Percentage of production volume from production locations where a business relationship has existed for at least five years.	85%	Stable business relationships support most aspects of the Code of Labour Practices, and give production locations a reason to invest in improving working conditions.	Supplier information provided by member company.	4	4	0

Comment: Teamdress started a business relationship with two of its production locations in the past five years. All other suppliers - the vast majority - have been working with Teamdress for more than five years.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.3 All (new) production locations are required to sign and return the questionnaire with the Code of Labour Practices before first bulk orders are placed.	2nd years + member and no new production locations selected	The CoLP is the foundation of all work between production locations and brands, and the first step in developing a commitment to improvements.	Signed CoLPs are on file.	N/A	2	0

Comment: All production locations signed the questionnaire with the CoLP. No new production locations were selected in 2020.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.4 Member company conducts human rights due diligence at all (new) production locations before placing orders.	Intermediate	Due diligence helps to identify, prevent and mitigate potential human rights problems at suppliers.	Documentation may include pre-audits, existing audits, other types of risk assessments.	2	4	0

Comment: Prior to entering a new sourcing country, Teamdress carries out a risk assessment, using external sources, including, but not limited to, Human Rights Watch, ILO and OECD. The quality manager, who is responsible for CSR, keeps track of social developments within the sourcing countries and updates the risk assessment form when issues occur. This risk assessment form is used to monitor human rights and ecological risks and to prioritise topics for discussion during the frequent visits to the production locations.

For risk assessment per factory, Teamdress uses a checklist with basic information such as production capacity and production processes, but also includes health and safety indicators. During factory visits this checklist is used to gather information and crosscheck. The supplier contract contains a clear requirement to commit to the Code of Labour Practices and is used as a basis to accept or block a potential supplier. The CSR manager reports to the CEO and has the right to veto a potential factory, based on the company's code of conduct.

COVID-10

As audits were not possible during the majority of 2020, Teamdress asked its suppliers to fill in a checklist as a self-assessment about the impact of the pandemic. Teamdress did note that the value of these self-assessments was limited as the responses given seemed to be too positive and did not reflect what Teamdress knew about its supply chain. Teamdress made the decision to not discuss the results with the suppliers as they were already working extremely hard to implement all necessary COVID-19 related health and safety measures. For one of its own suppliers in Moldova, Teamdress conducted an internal audit online through zoom, with a visual inspection via videocall. At the end of 2020, Teamdress was able to organise an external audit in one of its production locations.

The highest risks Teamdress identified through its risk assessments, based on consultation of external sources and conversations with its suppliers, was the loss of orders from other customers, which would result in suppliers losing work and subsequently needing to dismiss workers. The second highest identified risks were health and safety risks for the workers in the factories. In the majority of its suppliers, Teamdress has a leverage of over 20% and in most of these over 75%. This meant that Teamdress was able to play a large role in ensuring its suppliers did not lose any orders, which can be seen in the fact that Teamdress sourced for the same FOB or slightly more at its suppliers. Teamdress was able to do this also because it had a high stock of fabric and raw materials, so was able to supply the factories with the materials needed to continue producing. Through this, Teamdress was able to ensure that the factories did not lose work and did not have to dismiss any workers.

Most of Teamdress' suppliers were able to continue producing more or less as normal throughout the pandemic, but some had to occasionally reduce capacity due to school and kindergarten closures. One of Teamdress' suppliers in Moldova had to close for three weeks (14 production days) when the village it is in was quarantined. The factory closure was carefully arranged by the supplier and workers continued to receive their wages. The reopening of the factory was approved by local authorities. Teamdress, ensure that all necessary health and safety measures were implemented at its four own factories and discussed measures with its CMT factories and checked implementation through photographic evidence. Teamdress did not verify OHS measures taken at factories which it was exiting.

Recommendation: It is advised to describe the process of assessing working conditions at potential new suppliers in a sourcing strategy that is agreed upon with top management/sourcing staff.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.5 Production location compliance with Code of Labour Practices is evaluated in a systematic manner.	Yes	A systemic approach is required to integrate social compliance into normal business processes, and supports good decisionmaking.	Documentation of systemic approach: rating systems, checklists, databases, etc.	1	2	0

Comment: Teamdress systematically evaluated compliance to the CoLP at production locations, but this did not lead to production decisions. In 2020, Teamdress has focused on updating a social compliance form to monitor each production location. The CSR manager keeps track of status and has a clear overview of social compliance of each factory.

In 2020, Teamdress stopped working with three suppliers, one in Albania, one in Ukraine and one of their own suppliers in Moldova. The decision to terminate business relationships is not taken lightly by Teamdress and efforts are made to first find other solutions. Despite of this, Teamdress does not have a written responsible exit strategy policy. In Albania, the decision was made to end the relationship because the costs of the transport of raw materials and finished products were too high compared to the production capacity of the location. Efforts were made to increase capacity at the factory or to find another factory nearby but neither proved possible. The supplier in the Ukraine had one of the highest prices per minute, partially due to the steep increase in minimum wage over the last 10 years and the loss of sales experienced by Teamdress, which meant that it was no longer tenable for Teamdress to continue sourcing there. However, a contract for a smaller production capacity was later established for this supplier as they produce high quality safety garments. Teamdress' own supplier in Moldova was shut because the rental contract expired, and it was not possible to find enough new workers to increase the capacity needed for renewing the rental contract. In all situations, Teamdress discussed its concerns with the suppliers well in advance to try to find other solutions. This meant that the suppliers were aware of Teamdress' concerns and the difficulties in addressing them, ensuring that the suppliers knew the business relationship was ending well in advance. As per the contract with its suppliers, Teamdress officially notified the suppliers three months in advance of the ending of the business relationship. Teamdress also consulted the Fair Wear responsible exit strategy.

Teamdress maintained close contact with all its suppliers from the start of the pandemic. COVID-19 did not cause Teamdress to cancel or reduce orders. Under normal conditions, Teamdress is in contact with its suppliers on a weekly basis to discuss capacity and production planning. During the pandemic, this weekly contact continued and was often supplemented by additional calls where issues were raised by the suppliers to Teamdress. Solutions to the issues and challenges were then found together, and often included reducing or increasing production capacity of the suppliers. The highest risks Teamdress identified through conversations with its suppliers was the loss of orders from other customers, which would result in suppliers losing work and subsequently losing employees. Second highest were health and safety risks for the workers in the factories.

Teamdress did not cancel or postpone any orders due to COVID-19. In fact, due to Teamdress' contracts with their suppliers based on production capacity, it was possible to increase or decrease Teamdress' orders based on supplier needs. One supplier in Moldova had to shut for two weeks as the entire village in which it is situated had to quarantine. When this happened, Teamdress accepted delays for most orders from that supplier but did reassign some high priority orders to other suppliers. As soon as the factory reopened with approval from local authorities, Teamdress returned to the normal production capacity. In solidarity with the factory, the workers took the two weeks of factory closure as paid leave. Generally speaking, Teamdress took care to make sure that it met the available capacity at its suppliers, by either increasing or decreasing the volume in the order.

Recommendation: Fair Wear encourages Teamdress Holding GmbH to implement a responsible exit strategy and make sure all relevant staff is informed about this.

Teamdress is encouraged to make more explicit how social compliance in the supplier rating system in which quality, relationship, price, and planning are assessed is weighted and how compliance with CoLP leads to production decisions.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.6 The member company's production planning systems support reasonable working hours.	Strong, integrated systems in place.	Member company production planning systems can have a significant impact on the levels of excessive overtime at production locations.	Documentation of robust planning systems.	4	4	0

Comment: Teamdress is in direct contact with suppliers about production planning. The member company has a good insight of capacity per production location. Given the high leverage at its suppliers, Teamdress is able to make an accurate production plan. All products are defined in sewing minutes and orders are placed based on the available production capacity at each factory. A total of 2,000 production minutes per week (the equivalent of some 33 hours) per sewing worker is taken as a basis for planning, which supports reasonable working hours and ensures suppliers a steady supply of work. A space of 20% of capacity is built into the plan, in case of rush orders. Teamdress is also able to control the flow of orders through its stock program, reducing the risk of overtime. Any request for overtime at its suppliers must be approved by the General Director of Teamdress before it is forwarded to the factories.

As Teamdress has fabric in stock, fabric delays do not happen. Suppliers also have fixed minimum orders guarantees with suppliers. When orders suddenly need to be increased because of customer demands, Teamdress tries to find a solution that doesn't affect working hours, such as splitting orders. During COVID-19 this was really important as it enabled Teamdress to respond to suppliers' available production capacity and thereby reduced the risk of overtime.

Sometimes Teamdress receives orders that require repairs. When this happens, the member brand sends the items back to the factory to repair on the factory's costs. If the delivery date for the customer is too close for this to be possible, Teamdress repairs the items and invoices the costs to the factory in a way that is tenable for the factory. By repairing the items itself, Teamdress avoids putting last-minute pressure on the factory. Teamdress also makes sure that the costs invoiced to the factory are manageable and do not put them under financial pressure.

Recommendation: If quality problems occur often, Teamdress should discuss the root causes of this with the supplier and discuss whether Teamdress can support in addressing these.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.7 Degree to which member company mitigates root causes of excessive overtime.	Intermediate efforts	Some production delays are outside of the control of member companies; however there are a number of steps that can be taken to address production delays without resorting to excessive overtime.	Evidence of how member responds to excessive overtime and strategies that help reduce the risk of excessive overtime, such as: root cause analysis, reports, correspondence with factories, etc.	3	6	0

Comment: In several audits done in 2018, 2019 and 2020 overtime records could not be verified due to incomplete data. Teamdress has not identified excessive overtime as a main risk in their production countries during their human rights due diligence. The way in which Teamdress adjusts its orders according to the available production capacity of each of its suppliers work to mitigate risk of excessive overtime even further. However, it is important to have accurate working hours recorded.

COVID-19 did not have any impact on working hours.

Recommendation: Teamdress should make sure that working hours and overtime hours are recorded accurately and discuss ways in which it can support its suppliers in achieving this.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.8 Member company can demonstrate the link between its buying prices and wage levels in production locations.	Intermediate	Understanding the labour component of buying prices is an essential first step for member companies towards ensuring the payment of minimum wages – and towards the implementation of living wages.	Interviews with production staff, documents related to member’s pricing policy and system, buying contracts.	2	4	0

Comment: Teamdress works with standard minutes and contracts with suppliers are based on minutes instead of pieces. Calculations for pricing per minute are based on sampling done at Teamdress' own location in Poland. Teamdress has insights into how these standard minute prices relate to wages paid to workers at its own factories but not at its CMT factories.

Teamdress was not aware if its suppliers made additional wage costs to implement COVID-19 measures. In its own factories, Teamdress supplied the materials needed to implement health and safety measures, such as plexiglass sheets placed in between workstations and other relevant PPE. Teamdress did not make itself aware of costs incurred by its CMT suppliers, both in terms of wages and implementing OHS measures.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Teamdress Holding GmbH to expand their knowledge of cost break downs of all product groups. A next step would be to calculate the labour minute costs of its products to be able to calculate the exact costs of labour and link this to their own buying prices. Fair Wear's labour minute value and product costing calculator also enables suppliers to include any COVID-19 related costs. Priority would be to make sure this level of transparency can be achieved with their suppliers.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.9 Member company actively responds if production locations fail to pay legal minimum wages and/or fail to provide wage data to verify minimum wage is paid.	No problems reported/no audits	If a supplier fails to pay minimum wage or minimum wage payments cannot be verified, Fair Wear member companies are expected to hold management of the supplier accountable for respecting local labour law. Payment below minimum wage must be remediated urgently.	Complaint reports, CAPs, additional emails, Fair Wear Audit Reports or additional monitoring visits by a Fair Wear auditor, or other documents that show minimum wage issue is reported/resolved.	N/A	0	-2

Comment: Failure to pay legal minimum wage was not a problem reported in the audit conducted in 2020. At almost all of Teamdress' factories, workers receive a fixed salary during the first three months of employment. This fixed salary is based on the legal minimum wage. After three months, when the worker has achieved a higher degree of productivity, the worker receives a piece rate payment. The piece rates for workers in factories allow workers at 60% efficiency to earn at least legal minimum wages. The legal minimum wage is guaranteed for workers below 60% efficiency. Higher efficiency rates mean workers are earning up to double the minimum wage, which is supported by audit findings.

No legal minimum wage issues due to COVID-19 were identified by Teamdress through dialogue with its suppliers. Teamdress has a high leverage in almost all its suppliers and did not cancel any orders. Orders are based on the factories' available production capacity and Teamdress increased or decreased these according to the factories' needs. Teamdress did not verify that workers received their wages but judged the risk to be fairly low due to the fact that factories did not lose orders.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends that Teamdress verifies that workers receive their wages during crisis situations such as COVID-19 even when its orders remain stable.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.10 Evidence of late payments to suppliers by member company.	No	Late payments to suppliers can have a negative impact on production locations and their ability to pay workers on time. Most garment workers have minimal savings, and even a brief delay in payments can cause serious problems.	Based on a complaint or audit report; review of production location and member company financial documents.	0	0	-1

Comment: There was no evidence of late payments by Teamdress in 2020.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.11 Degree to which member company assesses and responds to root causes for wages that are lower than living wages in production locations.	Intermediate	Assessing the root causes for wages lower than living wages will determine what strategies/interventions are needed for increasing wages, which will result in a systemic approach	Evidence of how payment below living wage was addressed, such as: Internal policy and strategy documents, reports, correspondence with factories, etc	4	6	0

Comment: Teamdress has shown an increase in prices of 25% between 2018 and 2020.

Wages are discussed openly between Teamdress and its suppliers, including how they relate to the cost of living, including rent, electricity and food. However, Teamdress prefers to hold these conversations in person, which was not possible in 2020, which means that no further steps have been taken.

Recommendation: Fair Wear encourages Teamdress Holding GmbH to involve worker representatives and local organisations in assessing root causes of wages lower than living wages. It is advised that the outcomes of the root cause analysis are discussed internally and with top management, to form a basis for an embedded strategy.

Fair Wear also encourages Teamdress to define a target wage and begin implementing these, starting with its own factories.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.12 Percentage of production volume from factories owned by the member company (bonus indicator).	35%	Owning a supplier increases the accountability and reduces the risk of unexpected CoLP violations. Given these advantages, this is a bonus indicator. Extra points are possible, but the indicator will not negatively affect an member company's score.	Supplier information provided by member company.	1	2	0

Comment: Teamdress is owner of four production locations; one in Poland, two in Moldova and one factory in Ukraine. These factories cover 35% of Teamdress' total production volume.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.13 Member company determines and finances wage increases.	Intermediate	Assessing the root causes for wages lower than living wages will determine what strategies/interventions are needed for increasing wages, which will result in a systemic approach.	Evidence of how payment below living wage was addressed, such as: internal policy and strategy documents, reports, correspondence with factories, etc.	2	6	0

Comment: Teamdress has continued to work on defining what its target wage should be, which has been difficult as the living wage benchmarks for the relevant sourcing countries are not set for rural areas. As a first step, Teamdress has ensured that all workers receive twice the minimum wage.

For the factories owned by Teamdress, the member brand has insight into what amount of the price increase is related to the wages of the workers. Yet, for the other production locations, Teamdress does not know the relation between increase of minute prices and wages.

Teamdress is aware of the costs related to increased wages and its role in paying its share of the increase.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Teamdress to investigate whether the price increase has actually led to a wage increase. In determining what is needed and how wages should be increased, Fair Wear recommends Teamdress to involve worker representation.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.14 Percentage of production volume where the member company pays its share of the target wage.	0%	Fair Wear member companies are challenged to adopt approaches that absorb the extra costs of increasing wages.	Member company's own documentation, evidence of target wage implementation, such as wage reports, factory documentation, communication with factories, etc.	0	6	0

Comment: In 2019, Teamdress set and implemented a target wage for two of its own production locations, both belonging to the same supplier in Moldova. Unfortunately, this was the supplier that had to close because of the rental contract ending and not being able to find enough workers to extend the contract. Teamdress has not set or implemented a target wage at any of its other locations, which means that the percentage of production volume where Teamdress paid its share of the target wage in 2020 was 0%.

Requirement: Teamdress Holding GmbH is expected to begin setting a target wage for its production locations.

Purchasing Practices

Possible Points: 50

Earned Points: 30

2. Monitoring and Remediation

Basic measurements	Result	Comments
% of production volume where an audit took place.	46%	
% of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled.	19%	To be counted towards the monitoring threshold, FWF low-risk policy should be implemented. See indicator 2.9. (N/A = no production in low risk countries.)
Member meets monitoring requirements for tail-end production locations.	Yes	
Requirement(s) for next performance check		
Total monitoring threshold:	65%	Measured as percentage of production volume (Minimums: 1 year: 40%; 2 years 60%; 3 years+: 80-100%)

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.1 Specific staff person is designated to follow up on problems identified by monitoring system.	Yes	Followup is a serious part of Fair Wear membership, and cannot be successfully managed on an ad-hoc basis.	Manuals, emails, etc., demonstrating who the designated staff person is.	2	2	-2

Comment: The Quality Manager of Teamdress is designated to follow up on social compliance related matters.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.2 Quality of own auditing system meets FWF standards.	Member makes use of FWF audits and/or external audits only	In case Fair Wear teams cannot be used, the member companies' own auditing system must ensure sufficient quality in order for Fair Wear to approve the auditing system.	Information on audit methodology.	N/A	0	-1

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.3 Audit Report and Corrective Action Plan (CAP) findings are shared with factory and worker representation where applicable. Improvement timelines are established in a timely manner.	Yes	2 part indicator: Fair Wear audit reports were shared and discussed with suppliers within two months of audit receipt AND a reasonable time frame was specified for resolving findings.	Corrective Action Plans, emails; findings of followup audits; brand representative present during audit exit meeting, etc.	2	2	-1

Comment: Teamdress was able to show that CAPs are shared with factories in a timely manner. It was difficult for Teamdress to establish timelines for follow up for the audit that took place in December 2019 as the business relationship with that supplier was going to end later in 2020. The audit conducted at the location in Ukraine took place in December 2020 and was shared with the factory in 2021.

Teamdress was also able to show that audit reports and CAPs were shared with worker representation.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.4 Degree of progress towards resolution of existing Corrective Action Plans and remediation of identified problems.	Basic	Fair Wear considers efforts to resolve CAPs to be one of the most important things that member companies can do towards improving working conditions.	CAP-related documentation including status of findings, documentation of remediation and follow up actions taken by member. Reports of quality assessments. Evidence of understanding relevant issues.	4	8	-2

Comment: One external audit was conducted in December 2019, which means that follow up was assessed in this performance check. Another external audit was conducted in December 2020.

The external audit that was conducted in December 2019 was at a supplier in Ukraine, with whom Teamdress has since ended its business relationship. This meant that Teamdress struggled to follow up on the CAP. However, Teamdress will restart its relationship with the supplier in 2021 and will take that opportunity to continue working on the CAP. As such, remediation will be checked again during the next brand performance check.

In terms of generally following up on CAPs, Teamdress has worked towards assuming a stronger, more proactive role in supporting the factories in implementing remediation activities. The member brand has created an excel template in which all information from different sources, such as internal audits, several external and Fair Wear audits, and government guidelines is integrated. This is shared with factory management but updated with general information and remediation activities by Teamdress. Through this, Teamdress is also taking a more central role in coordinating the process of the carrying out remediation activities, as they take the initiative to discuss, send reminders and ask for updates. Staff at Teamdress's headquarters support factory management by researching certain CAP findings and locate resources that the supplier needs, such as correct exit signs or understanding what legal requirements mean. Teamdress should make sure that it has a thorough understanding of the root causes of the more complex findings and works to remediate them.

Teamdress took an active role in remediating COVID-19 related issues, particularly in its own factories, but the approach was ad hoc rather than systematic. When issues arose, Teamdress aimed to find a solution as quickly as possible in a way that was manageable for the factory and always in an open dialogue. For example, Teamdress arranged and paid for all workers in one of its suppliers in Moldova to be tested for COVID-19 when there were several workers who had tested positive. Teamdress also arranged safe transportation for workers, plexiglass between workstations and raised awareness among the workers as to why the health and safety measures were important. This was verified through photographic evidence. Furthermore, Teamdress had a weekly check with all its suppliers to go over their production capacity and whether Teamdress' orders needed to be adapted. In these checks, Teamdress covered the health and safety measures that the factories were implementing and what was needed to fulfil governmental requirements.

Recommendation: It is expected that Teamdress takes a proactive role in remediating the CAP with its supplier in Ukraine when it starts working with the supplier again and that the more complex issues are also addressed.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.5 Percentage of production volume from production locations that have been visited by the member company in the previous financial year.	not applicable	Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, brands could often not visit their suppliers from March - December 2020. For consistency purposes, we therefore decided to score all our member brands N/A on visiting suppliers over the year 2020.	Member companies should document all production location visits with at least the date and name of the visitor.	N/A	4	0

Comment: As travel was restricted due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this indicator is not applicable in 2020 for all Fair Wear members.

During the time that visiting factories was not possible, Teamdress conducted videocalls with its suppliers and even held an internal audit via zoom. Photos verifying the implementation of health and safety measures were sent by the factories.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.6 Existing audit reports from other sources are collected.	Yes, quality assessed and corrective actions implemented	Existing reports form a basis for understanding the issues and strengths of a supplier, and reduces duplicative work.	Audit reports are on file; evidence of followup on prior CAPs. Reports of quality assessments.	3	3	0

Comment: As Teamdress only sources from countries where Fair Wear is not active, all of its audits are external. Teamdress assesses the quality of its external audit reports by consulting Fair Wear. Follow up on the CAPS from these audits is assessed in indicator 2.4.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.7 Compliance with FWF risk policies.	Advanced result on all relevant policies	Aside from regular monitoring and remediation requirements under Fair Wear membership, countries, specific areas within countries or specific product groups may pose specific risks that require additional steps to address and remediate those risks. Fair Wear requires member companies to be aware of those risks and implement policy requirements as prescribed by Fair Wear.	Policy documents, inspection reports, evidence of cooperation with other customers sourcing at the same factories, reports of meetings with suppliers, reports of additional activities and/or attendance lists as mentioned in policy documents.	6	6	-2
Compliance with FWF enhanced monitoring programme Bangladesh	Policies are not relevant to the company's supply chain			N/A	6	-2
Compliance with FWF Myanmar policy	Policies are not relevant to the company's supply chain			N/A	6	-2
Compliance with FWF guidance on abrasive blasting	Policies are not relevant to the company's supply chain			N/A	6	-2
Compliance with FWF guidance on risks related to Turkish garment factories employing Syrian refugees	Policies are not relevant to the company's supply chain			N/A	6	-2
Other risks specific to the member's supply chain are addressed by its monitoring system	Advanced			6	6	-2

Comment: Teamdress has informed itself on risks in Ukraine, Moldova, and Macedonia by consulting various sources, such as Human Rights Index, audit reports and country reports. A clear overview was made to evaluate the information gathered. The outcome of discussions during meetings with embassies in their production countries is also included in the evaluation. An example is the high risk of homophobia in Ukraine and the rest of Eastern Europe. Usually, such risks are shared with employees who are in regular contact with the supplier. Early in 2020 Teamdress organised a one-day training for production supervisors in the factories about Fair Wear, corporate social responsibility and its importance and country specific risks. It had been the intention to also give this training to factory management but due to COVID-19, this had to be postponed. The overview of specific risks is used in conversations with suppliers, but no concrete actions have been taken to mitigate these risks. Teamdress had originally planned to start discussing risks such as homophobia with its suppliers in 2020 but due to the lack of in person meetings, this has been postponed to 2021.

COVID-19

Teamdress was very aware of the risks posed by the pandemic in its supply chain and worked proactively to mitigate risks where possible and remediate issues when they arose.

Teamdress did not make use of the Fair Wear Health and Safety documentation as its production lies in countries where Fair Wear is not active, which means that the documents were not fully relevant. However, Teamdress did consult the documentation and used what was valuable for its situation. Teamdress supported its factories with implementing necessary safety measures and verified that these had taken place through collecting photographic evidence.

In terms of health and safety risks, Teamdress installed plexiglass walls, and provided facemasks and safe transportation in its own factories. For the suppliers from which Teamdress sources, Teamdress did not take the same health and safety measures. However, when a case of COVID-19 was confirmed at one of the suppliers in Moldova, Teamdress arranged and paid for all workers to be tested.

Bought in materials, transport to and from factories, high leverage in all factories, based orders of available production capacity so there were no cash flow problems for factories.

Teamdress prioritised remediating issues related to COVID-19 over following up on topics such as living wage and homophobia.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.8 Member company cooperates with other FWF member companies in resolving corrective actions at shared suppliers.	No CAPs active, no shared production locations or refusal of other company to cooperate	Cooperation between customers increases leverage and chances of successful outcomes. Cooperation also reduces the chances of a factory having to conduct multiple Corrective Action Plans about the same issue with multiple customers.	Shared CAPs, evidence of cooperation with other customers.	N/A	2	-1

Comment: Teamdress does not share any production locations with other Fair Wear members.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.9 Percentage of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled.	19%	Low-risk countries are determined by the presence and proper functioning of institutions which can guarantee compliance with national and international standards and laws. Fair Wear has defined minimum monitoring requirements for production locations in low-risk countries.	Documentation of visits, notification of suppliers of Fair Wear membership; posting of worker information sheets, completed questionnaires.	1	2	0

Member undertakes additional activities to monitor suppliers.: No (o)

Comment: There are two suppliers in low risk countries. Both have signed and returned the CoLP and the questionnaire and posted the Worker Information Sheet. The production location in Poland is Teamdress' own factory and logistics hub and it is usually visited twice a month. During 2020, when travel was not possible, most of the time there was daily contact between the supplier and Teamdress. The company also conducts its own, internal audit with its production locations, in 2020 that was done online and through videocalls.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.10 Extra bonus indicator: in case FWF member company conducts full audits at tail-end production locations (when the minimum required monitoring threshold is met).	No	Fair Wear encourages its members to monitor 100% of its production locations and rewards those members who conduct full audits above the minimum required monitoring threshold.	Production location information as provided to Fair Wear and recent Audit Reports.	N/A	2	0

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.11 Questionnaire is sent and information is collected from external brands resold by the member company.	No	Fair Wear believes it is important for affiliates that have a retail/wholesale arm to at least know if the brands they resell are members of Fair Wear or a similar organisation, and in which countries those brands produce goods.	Questionnaires are on file.	0	2	0

Comment: Out of the 16 external brands resold by Teamdress in 2019, one was not provided with the questionnaire. The other 15 did receive the questionnaire, nine have returned the questionnaire with the required information.

Recommendation: Fair Wear members are encouraged to make sure that they send the questionnaire to external brands resold and ask that they return the questionnaire with the required information.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.12 External brands resold by member companies that are members of another credible initiative (% of external sales volume).	43%	Fair Wear believes members who resell products should be rewarded for choosing to sell external brands who also take their supply chain responsibilities seriously and are open about in which countries they produce goods.	External production data in Fair Wear's information management system. Documentation of sales volumes of products made by Fair Wear or FLA members.	2	3	0

Comment: Two of the external brands resold by Teamdress are members of Fair Wear Foundation, representing 43% of the total external sales volume.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.13 Questionnaire is sent and information is collected from licensees.	No licensees	Fair Wear believes it is important for member companies to know if the licensee is committed to the implementation of the same labour standards and has a monitoring system in place.	Questionnaires are on file. Contracts with licensees.	N/A	1	0

Monitoring and Remediation

Possible Points: 29

Earned Points: 20

3. Complaints Handling

Basic measurements	Result	Comments
Number of worker complaints received since last check.	0	At this point, FWF considers a high number of complaints as a positive indicator, as it shows that workers are aware of and making use of the complaints system.
Number of worker complaints in process of being resolved.	0	
Number of worker complaints resolved since last check.	0	

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.1 A specific employee has been designated to address worker complaints.	Yes	Followup is a serious part of Fair Wear membership, and cannot be successfully managed on an ad-hoc basis.	Manuals, emails, etc., demonstrating who the designated staff person is.	1	1	-1

Comment: The CSR responsible person, who is also the Quality Manager, is responsible for addressing worker complaints.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.2 Member company has informed factory management and workers about the FWF CoLP and complaints hotline.	No	Informing both management and workers about the Fair Wear Code of Labour Practices and complaints hotline is a first step in alerting workers to their rights. The Worker Information Sheet is a tool to do this and should be visibly posted at all production locations.	Photos by company staff, audit reports, checklists from production location visits, etc.	-2	2	-2

Comment: During the annual factory visits by Teamdress staff it is checked whether posters are placed on a visible spot in the factory. Pictures are made and filed, shown during the Brand Performance Check. However, as Teamdress' supplier in Uzbekistan still needs to send evidence of the posting of the WIS, the member brand has been scored as 'no' for this indicator.

For the factories owned by Teamdress the process is less formal, as staff is very frequently present in the facilities and is able to monitor closely. The staff members are in close contact with the CSR manager, monitoring the status.

Requirement: Teamdress Holding GmbH must ensure that the Worker Information Sheet, including contact information of the local complaints handler of Fair Wear, is posted in factories in a location that is accessible to all workers. Member company should check by means of a visit whether the Worker Information Sheet is posted in the factories.

Please note that following Fair Wear’s policy for repeated non-compliance in Fair Wear’s Brand Performance Checks, members that receive an insufficient or -2 score on this indicator for the second year in a row, will be placed in the ‘Needs Improvement’ category.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.3 Degree to which member company has actively raised awareness of the FWF CoLP and complaints hotline.	0%	After informing workers and management of the Fair Wear CoLP and the complaints hotline, additional awareness raising and training is needed to ensure sustainable improvements and structural worker-management dialogue.	Training reports, Fair Wear’s data on factories enrolled in the WEP basic module. For alternative training activities: curriculum, training content, participation and outcomes.	0	6	0

Comment: Teamdress’ production takes place in countries without access to the Fair Wear complaints helpline. As such, none of Teamdress’ suppliers have been enrolled in Fair Wear’s Workplace Education Programme (WEP). Teamdress had planned to roll out a training programme for production managers of its suppliers about the Fair Wear CoLP, country-specific risks and access to remedy but was unable to because of the pandemic. It is intended to implement the trainings in the next financial year.

Requirement: Fair Wear requires members to actively raise awareness about the Fair Wear Code of Labour Practices and Fair Wear complaint hotline. Teamdress Holding GmbH should ensure good quality systematic training of workers and management on these topics. To this end members can either use Fair Wear’s Workplace Education Programme (WEP) basic module, or implement training related to the Fair Wear CoLP and complaint hotline through service providers or brand staff. Fair Wear’s guidance on training quality standards is available on the Member Hub.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.4 All complaints received from production location workers are addressed in accordance with the FWF Complaints Procedure.	No complaints received	Providing access to remedy when problems arise is a key element of responsible supply chain management. Member company involvement is often essential to resolving issues.	Documentation that member company has completed all required steps in the complaints handling process.	N/A	6	-2

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.5 Cooperation with other customers in addressing worker complaints at shared suppliers.	No complaints or cooperation not possible / necessary	Because most production locations supply several customers with products, involvement of other customers by the Fair Wear member company can be critical in resolving a complaint at a supplier.	Documentation of joint efforts, e.g. emails, sharing of complaint data, etc.	N/A	2	0

Complaints Handling

Possible Points: 9

Earned Points: -1

4. Training and Capacity Building

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
4.1 All staff at member company are made aware of FWF membership.	Yes	Preventing and remediating problems often requires the involvement of many different departments; making all staff aware of Fair Wear membership requirements helps to support cross-departmental collaboration when needed.	Emails, trainings, presentation, newsletters, etc.	1	1	0

Comment: Teamdress makes sure that all staff members are aware of Fair Wear membership, with a particular focus on staff who are in contact with production locations and those working in sales. It is addressed in sales meetings several times per year. Furthermore, a training was held for all production supervisors who visit Teamdress' factories, which included Fair Wear membership and the CoLP.

Recommendation: It is advised to develop a standard procedure for all new employees to get familiar with Fair Wear membership. Fair Wear has material available that can be used to inform (sales) staff.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
4.2 All staff in direct contact with suppliers are informed of FWF requirements.	Yes	Sourcing, purchasing and CSR staff at a minimum should possess the knowledge necessary to implement Fair Wear requirements and advocate for change within their organisations.	Fair Wear Seminars or equivalent trainings provided; presentations, curricula, etc.	2	2	-1

Comment: Purchasing and production planning staff are regularly updated about Fair Wear and its requirements. In fact, Fair Wear membership is part of the daily business, as the CSR manager is in close contact with the purchasing and production planning.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
4.3 All sourcing contractors/agents are informed about FWF's Code of Labour Practices.	Member does not use agents/contractors	Agents have the potential to either support or disrupt CoLP implementation. It is the responsibility of member company to ensure agents actively support the implementation of the CoLP.	Correspondence with agents, trainings for agents, Fair Wear audit findings.	N/A	2	0

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
4.4 Factory participation in training programmes that support transformative processes related to human rights.	0%	Complex human rights issues such as freedom of association or gender-based violence require more in-depth trainings that support factory-level transformative processes. Fair Wear has developed several modules, however, other (member-led) programmes may also count.	Training reports, Fair Wear's data on factories enrolled in training programmes. For alternative training activities: curriculum, training content, participation and outcomes.	0	6	0

Comment: No suppliers have been enrolled in training that supports transformative processes.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Teamdress Holding GmbH to implement training programmes that support factory-level transformation such as establishing functional internal grievance mechanisms, improving worker-management dialogue and communication skills or addressing gender-based violence. Training assessed under this indicator should go beyond raising awareness and focus on behavioural and structural change to improve working conditions. To this end, Teamdress Holding GmbH can implement advanced training through external training providers or brand staff. Non-Fair Wear training must follow the standards outlined in Fair Wear's guidance and checklist available on the Member Hub.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
4.5 Degree to which member company follows up after a training programme.	No training programmes have been conducted or member produces solely in low-risk countries	After factory-level training programmes, complementary activities such as remediation and changes on brand level will achieve a lasting impact.	Documentation of discussions with factory management and worker representatives, minutes of regular worker-management dialogue meetings or anti-harassment committees.	N/A	2	0

Training and Capacity Building

Possible Points: 9

Earned Points: 3

5. Information Management

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
5.1 Level of effort to identify all production locations.	Advanced	Any improvements to supply chains require member companies to first know all of their production locations.	Supplier information provided by member company. Financial records of previous financial year. Documented efforts by member company to update supplier information from its monitoring activities.	6	6	-2

Comment: Teamdress has demonstrated considerable efforts to identify all production locations. In its supplier contracts, Teamdress has included a clause which forbids subcontracting, unless written permission is acquired before hand. Secondly, Teamdress has created a document which shows information from suppliers such as production capacity and production processes, which is used as a check to make sure that Teamdress' orders can be produced at the location of the supplier. Teamdress double checks this during factory visits. Finally, Teamdress' orders are based on weekly production capacity in minutes available at each factory and orders are increased or decreased based on the suppliers needs. This is discussed during weekly production planning calls.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
5.2 CSR and other relevant staff actively share information with each other about working conditions at production locations.	Yes	CSR, purchasing and other staff who interact with suppliers need to be able to share information in order to establish a coherent and effective strategy for improvements.	Internal information system; status CAPs, reports of meetings of purchasing/CSR; systematic way of storing information.	1	1	-1

Comment: Audit reports and CAPs are available for all staff involved through the member brand's database. Important CSR information is shared prior to visiting a factory through the monthly meetings with production team and CSR manager. Critical audit findings are shared with top management whenever relevant.

Recommendation: It is advised to make relevant staff aware of the available tools Fair Wear offers, such as the Health and Safety guides, monitoring CAP documents, access to Fair Wear's online information system. Purchasing staff are recommended to share reports from factory visits that include a status update of implementing the CoLP.

Information Management

Possible Points: 7

Earned Points: 7

6. Transparency

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
6.1 Degree of member company compliance with FWF Communications Policy.	Minimum communications requirements are met AND no significant problems found	Fair Wear's communications policy exists to ensure transparency for consumers and stakeholders, and to ensure that member communications about Fair Wear are accurate. Members will be held accountable for their own communications as well as the communications behaviour of 3rd-party retailers, resellers and customers.	Fair Wear membership is communicated on member's website; other communications in line with Fair Wear communications policy.	2	2	-3

Comment: Information on Fair Wear membership is shared on the website of Teamdress. No significant problems were found and minimum communications requirements are met.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
6.2 Member company engages in advanced reporting activities.	No	Good reporting by members helps to ensure the transparency of Fair Wear's work and shares best practices with the industry.	Member company publishes one or more of the following on their website: Brand Performance Check, Audit Reports, Supplier List.	0	2	0

Comment: Teamdress has not disclosed its supplier list to the public, nor has it opted in for Fair Wear's new transparency policy. It does not publish brand performance checks, audits reports or the social report on its website.

Requirement: Fair Wear requires member brand to disclose production locations to other member brands in Fair Force and on the Fair Wear website.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Teamdress Holding GmbH to publish one or more of the following reports on its website: the Brand Performance Check report, audit reports, supplier information. Good reporting by members helps to ensure the transparency of the member and Fair Wear's work.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
6.3 Social Report is submitted to FWF and is published on member company's website.	Complete and accurate report submitted to FWF	The social report is an important tool for members to transparently share their efforts with stakeholders. Member companies should not make any claims in their social report that do not correspond with Fair Wear's communication policy.	Social report that is in line with Fair Wear's communication policy.	1	2	-1

Comment: Teamdress submitted its 2020 social report to Fair Wear.

Transparency

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 3

7. Evaluation

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
7.1 Systemic annual evaluation of FWF membership is conducted with involvement of top management.	Yes	An annual evaluation involving top management ensures that Fair Wear policies are integrated into the structure of the company.	Meeting minutes, verbal reporting, Powerpoints, etc.	2	2	0

Comment: An annual management review is done in October by the CEO, shareholders and CSR manager. The CSR manager is in charge of the agenda and the results of the Brand Performance Check are discussed to set priorities and goals for the next year.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
7.2 Level of action/progress made on required changes from previous Brand Performance Check implemented by member company.	40%	In each Brand Performance Check report, Fair Wear may include requirements for changes to management practices. Progress on achieving these requirements is an important part of Fair Wear membership and its process approach.	Member company should show documentation related to the specific requirements made in the previous Brand Performance Check.	2	4	-2

Comment: Teamdress had two requirements to follow up on from last year's brand performance check. The first concerned supporting its suppliers in remediation through sustained responses to CAPs. Teamdress was not able to fully respond to this requirement as the CAPs in question were active for suppliers where Teamdress ended its business relationship. This meant that the member company was still not able to take on more than a very basic role, including emailing the factory for evidence of remediation but without conducting any root cause analyses for complex findings. However, Teamdress took some steps into offering more proactive support in the remediation of an audit conducted late 2020. Further follow up will be assessed in the next brand performance check.

The second requirement was related to awareness raising of the Fair Wear CoLP and complaints mechanism. Teamdress had set out a plan for rolling out awareness raising trainings for its suppliers but was unable to do so due to COVID-19. Teamdress will carry these trainings out when possible.

Evaluation

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 4

Recommendations to Fair Wear

Teamdress recommends that Fair Wear develops more guidance for Eastern European production countries. As Eastern Europe is the focus of Teamdress' production, a lot of Fair Wear's guidance is not relevant as it is geared more towards Asian production countries.

Scoring Overview

Category	Earned	Possible
Purchasing Practices	30	50
Monitoring and Remediation	20	29
Complaints Handling	-1	9
Training and Capacity Building	3	9
Information Management	7	7
Transparency	3	6
Evaluation	4	6
Totals:	66	116

Benchmarking Score (earned points divided by possible points)

57

Performance Benchmarking Category

Good

Brand Performance Check details

Date of Brand Performance Check:

26-05-2021

Conducted by:

Liselotte Goemans

Interviews with:

Annegret Dyck - Quality Manager and CSR responsible person

Corinna Horndahl - CEO

Sacha Glumac - Production Manager